a pair of relatively rigid elements defining a pair of independent passages into said free end of said second prosthesis section; and

Delete conclude

a third and fourth prosthesis section telescopically engaging said relatively rigid elements on said free end of said second prosthesis section, each said third and fourth prosthesis sections including a pair of annular resilient deformable spring elements and a tubular graft, said spring elements attached to free ends of said tubular graft, at least one of said spring elements adapted to engage the interior of said second prosthesis section.

Please cancel claims 34 and 35.

Claim 36, line 1, delete "35" and insert in lieu thereof --32--.

Please cancel claims 50 and 51.

REMARKS

Claim 12

Claim 12 has been amended to call for an annular spring. There can be absolutely no doubt that the Parodi reference does not teach a spring. It would stretch English usage beyond all reasonable bounds to attempt to assert that the malleable element in Parodi (See Parodi, col. 14, line 12) could constitute what is called a spring in normal English usage. While one may argue that terms such as "resilient" are relative terms, there is simply no accepted definition on the word "spring" that could encompass a malleable element.

Claim 13

The rejection of the claims dependent on claim 12 is not understood. There is no basis in the cited reference to reject

all of the dependent claims. The office action fails to set forth any analysis of the § 102 rejection of these claims.

Claim 13 calls for a plurality of circularly oriented wire strands formed of resilient metal. There simply is no argument that would establish that Parodi shows a plurality of resilient strands. The element 310 cited by the Examiner is a single, malleable strand of wire.

Claim 14

Claim 14 calls for the region of the graft proximate the spring having a diameter greater than the diameter of the portion of the graft spaced from the element. There is absolutely no support in the cited reference to anticipate this limitation.

Claim 15

Claim 15 calls for a graft having a diameter greater on the end connected to the spring than on the end spaced from the spring, the graft tapering in diameter from the end connected to the spring to a reduced diameter and having a relatively constant diameter over a portion of the remainder of the graft. Again, no application of the reference to these limitations is made and the reference is plainly lacking any support for the rejection.

Claim 16

Claim 16 calls for springs to be attached to both ends of the graft.

Claim 21

For reasons discussed above, claim 21 distinguishes over the Parodi reference. In addition, claim 21 calls for a folded annular spring. There simply is no such element in Parodi. That spring must have a pair of loops extending in one direction

and a second pair of loops extending in the opposite direction. Again, no such structure is shown in Parodi.

Claim 22

Parodi does not show a structure wherein the second pair of loops making with the spring are arranged to avoid occlusion of the renal arteries.

Claim 23

Claim 23 calls for the graft having a diameter less than the end to the form the diameter of the spring.

Claim 24

Claim 24 calls for the spring to be formed of a plurality of strands. Again, the element 315 is Parodi is malleable and there is no indication that it is formed of more than one strand. Using multiple strands is highly advantageous as explained in applicant's specification. See page 9, lines 9-23. Each of the strands may be high resilient without contributing stiffness that would arise from forming the entire structure from a larger diameter wire. Thus, the use of a plurality of strands gives comparable clamping force with less stiffness and thereby greater resiliency.

Claim 32

Claim 32 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 34 and 35, which were indicated to be allowable.

* * *

In response to the indication on page 4 of the office action, a new form PTO-1149 listing the foreign language references is enclosed.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 11/3/99

Timothy N. Trop
Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER, HU & MILES, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Ste. 100
Houston, TX 77024
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]